

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.

NELSON FERNANDEZ,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**KD TRAN, LLC, d/b/a ZERO DEGREES,
a foreign limited liability company; and
M-T BOBA & DESSERTS LLC, d/b/a
ZERO DEGREES, a Florida limited liability
Company,**

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff NELSON FERNANDEZ, through undersigned counsel, sues Defendants KD TRAN, LLC, d/b/a ZERO DEGREES, a foreign limited liability company (“KD TRAN”), and M-T BOBA & DESSERTS LLC, d/b/a ZERO DEGREES, a Florida limited liability company (“MT”), and alleges as follows:

1. This is an action for declaratory and injunctive relief, attorney’s fees, costs, and litigation expenses for unlawful disability discrimination in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§12181-12189 (“ADA”), as amended, and 28 C.F.R. Part 36. This also is an action for declaratory and injunctive relief, attorney’s fees, costs, and litigation expenses for unlawful disability discrimination in violation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. §794, *et seq.* (“Rehab Act”).

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this case based on federal question jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. §1331, and the provisions of the ADA and the Rehab Act. Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§2201 and 2202.

3. Venue is proper in this Court as all actions complained of herein and injuries and damages suffered occurred in the Southern District of Florida.

4. Plaintiff NELSON FERNANDEZ is a resident of Palm Beach County, Florida, is *sui juris*, and is disabled as defined by the ADA and ADA Amendments Act of 2008, 42 U.S.C. §12101 (“ADAAA”). Plaintiff is also expressly authorized to bring this case under the Rehab Act, 29 U.S.C. §§794(a)(2) and 794(b)(3)(A), and under Section 505-f of the Rehab Act which enforces Section 504 of the Rehab Act, 29 U.S.C. §§794 and 794a, incorporating the rights and remedies set forth in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000d, *et seq.*

5. Plaintiff is and at all relevant times has been a visually impaired and physically disabled person who has been diagnosed with Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis (“RRMS”). As a result of his disease, Plaintiff is currently paralyzed in approximately 80% to 90% of his body as a whole and only has very limited use of his left hand. Further as a consequence of his disease, Plaintiff has developed optic neuritis and is visually disabled, with complete blindness in one eye and very limited vision in the other eye. Plaintiff thus is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including, but not limited to, seeing and accurately visualizing his world and adequately traversing obstacles. As such, he is a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12102(1)-(2), the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§36.101, *et seq.*, and 42 U.S.C. §3602(h). Plaintiff is also an otherwise qualified individual with a disability who has been denied the benefits of a program or activity receiving federal financial assistance and is thus covered by the Rehab Act, 29 U.S.C. §794(a). Plaintiff further is an advocate

of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purposes of asserting his civil rights and monitoring, ensuring, and determining whether places of public accommodation and/or their respective and associated websites are in compliance with the ADA, the Rehab Act, and any other applicable disability laws, regulations, and ordinances.

6. Because he is visually disabled, Plaintiff cannot use his computer without the assistance of appropriate and available auxiliary aids, screen reader software, and other technology and assistance. Screen reader software translates the visual internet into an auditory equivalent. At a rapid pace, the software reads the content of a webpage to the user. “The screen reading software uses auditory cues to allow a visually impaired user to effectively use websites. For example, when using the visual internet, a seeing user learns that a link may be ‘clicked,’ which will bring him to another webpage, through visual cues, such as a change in the color of the text (often text is turned from black to blue). When the sighted user's cursor hovers over the link, it changes from an arrow symbol to a hand. The screen reading software uses auditory -- rather than visual -- cues to relay this same information. When a sight impaired individual reaches a link that may be ‘clicked on,’ the software reads the link to the user, and after reading the text of the link says the word ‘clickable.’...Through a series of auditory cues read aloud by the screen reader, the visually impaired user can navigate a website by listening and responding with his keyboard.” *Andrews v. Blick Art Materials, LLC*, 17-CV-767, 2017 WL 6542466, at *6-7 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2017).

7. Defendant KD TRAN is a foreign limited liability company based in Glendale, Arizona that conducts substantial business in, and derives substantial financial benefits from and within, the State of Florida through its ownership, control, licensing, and/or franchising of “Zero Degrees” Asian-Hispanic fusion restaurants. Defendant owns, operates, licenses, franchises,

and/or controls a chain of 31 restaurants selling Asian-Hispanic fusion drinks and snacks to the public, including the restaurant owned and operated by Defendant MT that Plaintiff intended to patronize in the near future located at 6716 Forest Hill Boulevard, Greenacres, Florida. Defendant MT is a Florida limited liability company authorized to do business and doing business in Palm Beach County and the State of Florida. KD TRAN has also at all relevant times been doing business nationwide and in the State of Florida through its associated website, <https://www.zerodegreescompany.com> (the “Website”), and its affiliated, authorized, associated, licensed, and/or franchised companies operating physical “Zero Degrees” restaurants, including the restaurant owned and operated by MT in Greenacres, Florida. Indeed, KD TRAN has at all times relevant hereto linked to the Website all of its authorized, affiliated, associated, licensed, and/or franchised restaurants, including the “Zero Degrees” restaurant owned and operated by MT, such that the Website has been and continues to be held out as the official Website for MT and its owned restaurant. Indeed, the Website is specifically linked, through a “store locator” feature, to each “Zero Degrees” physical restaurant in the U.S., including the restaurant owned and operated by MT. The Website link to the “Zero Degrees” restaurants, including the MT owned and operated restaurant, not only allows the public to locate the restaurants, but also allows visitors to the Website to make online purchases of Defendants’ food and beverages that are also available for purchase in the physical restaurants. The Website thus has acted, and continues to act, as a critical point of sale for the food and beverage products made in and delivered from the physical “Zero Degrees” restaurants, including the restaurant owned and operated by MT in Greenacres, Florida. Defendants thus together own, operate, and/or control, through their contracts and agreements, including franchise agreements, one or more “Zero Degrees” physical restaurants that provide food and beverage purchases and delivery services to the public, including the restaurant owned by MT.

Defendant KD TRAN also owns, leases, leases to, and/or operates a business that is the recipient of federal financial assistance to the company as a whole within the meaning of Rehab Act, 29 U.S.C. §794(b)(3)(A)(i), through its receipt of Economic Injury Disaster Loan (“EIDL”) fund from the U.S. Government. See attached Exhibit “A”.

8. Plaintiff’s visual disability limits him in the performance of major life activities, including sight, and he requires assistive technologies, auxiliary aids, and services for effective communication, including communication in connection with his use of a computer.

9. Plaintiff frequently accesses the internet. Because he is significantly and permanently visually disabled, to effectively communicate and comprehend information available on the internet and thereby access and comprehend websites, Plaintiff uses commercially available screen reader software to interface with the various websites.

10. At all times material hereto, Defendants were and still are organizations that own, operates, franchises, and/or controls restaurants under the brand name “Zero Degrees”. Each Zero Degrees restaurant is open to the public. As the owners, operators, franchisors, and/or controllers of these restaurants, Defendants are defined as a place of “public accommodation” within meaning of the ADA because they are private entities which own, control, and/or operate “a restaurant, bar, or other establishment serving food and drink,” per 42 U.S.C. §12181(7)(B) and 28 C.F.R. §36.104(2).

11. Because Defendants are a store open to the public, each of Defendants’ physical stores is a place of public accommodation subject to the requirements of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12182, §12181(7)(B), and its implementing regulations, 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

12. Defendant KD TRAN also owns, controls, maintains, and/or operates the Website. One of the functions of the Website is to provide the public information on the locations of

Defendants' restaurants, including the MT owned and operated restaurant, through a "store locator" and food and beverage ordering feature. Defendants also sell to the public their food and beverage products through the Website, which acts as a point of sale for the food and beverages made in and delivered from Defendants' physical restaurants.

13. The Website also services Defendants' physical restaurants by providing information on available food and beverage products, services, editorials, sales campaigns, events, and other information that Defendants are interested in communicating to its customers.

14. Because the Website allows the public the ability to secure information about the location of Defendants' physical restaurants, purchase food and beverages made in and delivered from the physical restaurants, and arrange in-restaurant pickups of food and beverages ordered and purchased online, the Website has a nexus to, and is an extension of and gateway to, the goods, services, privileges, and advantages of Defendants' physical restaurants, which are places of public accommodation under the ADA. As an extension of and service, privilege, and advantage provided by places of public accommodation as defined under the ADA, the Website is an extension of the services, privileges, and advantages made available to the general public by Defendants at and through their brick-and-mortar locations and businesses. Furthermore, the Website is a necessary service and privilege of Defendants' physical restaurants in that, as a point of sale for restaurants, it enables users of the Website to make online purchases and arrange deliveries of Defendants' food and beverage products that are also available from and in their physical restaurants.

15. Because the public can view and purchase Defendants' products through the Website that are also offered for sale in Defendants' physical restaurants, thus having the Website act as a point of sale for Defendants' products that are also sold in the physical restaurants and

arrange in-restaurant pickups of products purchased online, the Website is an extension of and gateway to the physical restaurants, which are places of public accommodation pursuant to the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12181(7)(B). As such, the Website is a necessary service, privilege, and advantage of Defendants' brick-and-mortar restaurants that must comply with all requirements of the ADA, must not discriminate against individuals with visual disabilities, and must not deny those individuals the same full and equal access to and enjoyment of the goods, services, privileges, and advantages afforded the non-visually disabled public both online and in the physical restaurants.

16. At all times material hereto, Defendants were and still are organizations owning, operating, linking to, deriving substantial financial benefits from, and/or controlling the Website. Since the Website is open to the public through the internet, by this nexus the Website is an intangible service, privilege, and advantage of Defendants' brick-and-mortar restaurants that must comply with all requirements of the ADA, must not discriminate against individuals with visual disabilities, and must not deny those individuals the same full and equal access to and enjoyment of the goods, services, privileges, and advantages as afforded the non-disabled public both online and in the physical restaurants. As such, Defendants have subjected themselves and the Website to the requirements of the ADA. In addition, as recipients of federal financial assistance, Defendant KD TRAN has subjected itself and all its operations, programs, and activities, including the Website, to the requirements, prohibitions, and anti-discrimination provisions of the Rehab Act.

17. Plaintiff is and has been a customer who is interested in patronizing, and intends to patronize in the near future once the Website's access barriers are removed or remedied, one or more of Defendants' physical restaurants (including the restaurant located at 6716 Forest Hill Boulevard, Greenacres, Florida), and to search for the brick-and-mortar restaurants, check

restaurant hours and product pricing, place online orders, arrange online deliveries, and arrange in-restaurant pickups of food and beverages purchased online. In the alternative, Plaintiff intends to monitor the Website in the near future as a tester to ascertain whether it has been remedied and updated to interact properly with screen reader software.

18. The opportunity to shop and pre-shop Defendants' food and beverage products, arrange deliveries of food and beverages made in the physical restaurants, and arrange in-restaurant pickups of food and beverages made in the physical restaurants are important and necessary accommodations for Plaintiff because traveling outside of his home as a visually disabled individual is often a difficult, hazardous, frightening, frustrating, and confusing experience. Defendants have not provided its business information in any other digital format that is accessible for use by blind and visually disabled individuals using screen reader software.

19. Like many consumers, Plaintiff accesses a number of websites at a time to help plan his physical location visits and to compare products, services, prices, sales, discounts, and promotions. Plaintiff may look at several dozens of sites to compare features, discounts, promotions, and prices.

20. During the month of September 2022, Plaintiff attempted on a number of occasions to utilize the Website to browse through the merchandise and online offers to educate himself as to the food and beverage products, sales, discounts, and promotions being offered, learn about the brick-and-mortar restaurants, check restaurant hours, and check product pricing with the intent to make a purchase through the Website or in one of the physical restaurants. Plaintiff also attempted to access and utilize the Website in his capacity as a tester to determine whether it was accessible to blind and visually disabled persons such as himself who use screen reader software to access and navigate company websites.

21. Plaintiff utilizes available screen reader software that allows individuals who are blind and visually disabled to communicate with websites. However, Defendant's Website contains access barriers that prevent free and full use by blind and visually disabled individuals using keyboards and available screen reader software. These barriers are pervasive and include, but are not limited to:

- a. Home page button is mislabeled;
- b. Choose a drink to order and a window opens with no description and the cursor continues to read information from the previous or back page; it does not permit you to add to your order until the user has navigated through the back page;
- c. The "X" located in the upper corner used to close the window is mislabeled;
- d. The plus sign (+) used to increase quantities to order is mislabeled; and
- e. Once in the shopping cart, the trash can icon used to remove an item is mislabeled.

22. Plaintiff attempted to locate an "accessibility" notice, statement, or policy on the Website that would direct him to a webpage with contact information for disabled individuals who have questions or concerns about, or who are having difficulties communicating with, the Website. Although the Website appeared to have an "accessibility" statement displayed and an "accessibility" widget/plugin added, the "accessibility" statement and widget/plugin, when tested, still could not be effectively accessed by, and continued to be a barrier to, blind and visually disabled persons, including Plaintiff as a completely blind person. Plaintiff, thus, was unable to receive any meaningful or prompt assistance through the "accessibility" statement and the widget/plugin to enable him to quickly, fully, and effectively navigate the Website.

23. The fact that Plaintiff could not communicate with or within the Website left him feeling excluded, as he is unable to participate in the same shopping experience, with the same

access to the merchandise, sales, discounts, and promotions, as provided at the Website and in the physical restaurants as the non-visually disabled public.

24. Plaintiff desires and intends, in the near future once the Website's access barriers are removed or remedied, to patronize one or more of Defendants' physical restaurants and to use the Website, but he is presently unable to do so as he is unable to effectively communicate with Defendants due to his severe visual disability and the Website's access barriers. Alternatively, as a tester using screen reader software, Plaintiff is unable to effectively access, navigate, and communicate with Defendants through the Website due to his severe visual disability and the Website's access barriers. Thus, Plaintiff, as well as others who are blind and with visual disabilities, will suffer continuous and ongoing harm from Defendants' intentional acts, omissions, policies, and practices as set forth herein unless properly enjoined by this Court.

25. Because of the nexus between Defendants' restaurants and the Website, and the fact that the Website clearly provides support for and is connected to Defendants' restaurants for its operation and use, the Website is an intangible service, privilege, and advantage of Defendants' brick-and-mortar restaurants that must comply with all requirements of the ADA, must not discriminate against individuals with disabilities, and must not deny those individuals the same full and equal access to and enjoyment of the goods, services, privileges, and advantages as afforded the non-visually disabled public both online and in the physical restaurants, which are places of public accommodations subject to the requirements of the ADA.

26. On information and belief, Defendants have not initiated a Web Accessibility Policy to ensure full and equal use of the Website by individuals with disabilities.

27. On information and belief, Defendants have not instituted a Web Accessibility Committee to ensure full and equal use of Website by individuals with disabilities.

28. On information and belief, Defendants have not designated an employee as a Web Accessibility Coordinator to ensure full and equal use of the Website by individuals with disabilities.

29. On information and belief, Defendants have not instituted a Web Accessibility User Accessibility Testing Group to ensure full and equal use of the Website by individuals with disabilities.

30. On information and belief, Defendants have not instituted a User Accessibility Testing Group to ensure full and equal use of the Website by individuals with disabilities.

31. On information and belief, Defendants have not instituted a Bug Fix Priority Policy.

32. On information and belief, Defendants have not instituted an Automated Web Accessibility Testing program.

33. Defendants have not created and instituted an effective Specialized Customer Assistance line or service or email contact mode for customer assistance for the visually disabled.

34. Defendants have not created and instituted on the Website a useful or accessible page for individuals with disabilities, nor displayed a link and information hotline, nor created an information portal explaining when and how Defendants will have the Website, applications, and digital assets accessible to the visually disabled or blind community.

35. The Website does not meet the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (“WCAG”) 2.0 Level AA or higher versions of web accessibility.

36. Defendants have not disclosed to the public any intended audits, changes, or lawsuits to correct the inaccessibility of the Website to visually disabled individuals who want the safety and privacy of purchasing Defendants’ products offered on the Website and in the physical restaurants from their homes.

37. Defendants thus have not provided full and equal access to and enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations provided by and through the Website and their physical restaurants in contravention of the ADA and the Rehab Act.

38. Public accommodations under the ADA must ensure that their places of public accommodation provide effective communication for all members of the general public, including individuals with visual disabilities such as Plaintiff. Likewise, under the Rehab Act, public accommodations and companies that receive federal financial assistance for the company as a whole must not discriminate against disabled persons and are required to make the facilities, programs, or activities they operate fully and readily accessible to persons with disabilities.

39. The broad mandate of the ADA is to provide an equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities to participate in and benefit from all aspects of American civic and economic life. That mandate extends to internet shopping websites such as the Website at issue in the instant action. In addition, Congress enacted the Rehab Act to enforce the policy of the United States that all programs, projects and activities receiving federal assistance " ... be carried out in a manner consistent with the principles of ... inclusion, integration and full participation of the individuals [with disabilities]." 29 U.S.C. §701(c)(3).

40. Defendants are, and at all relevant times have been, aware of the barriers to effective communication within the Website which prevent individuals with visual disabilities from the means to comprehend information presented therein.

41. Defendants are, and at all relevant times have been, aware of the need to provide full access to all visitors to the Website.

42. The barriers that exist on the Website result in discriminatory and unequal treatment of individuals with visual disabilities, including Plaintiff.

43. Plaintiff has no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law to redress the wrongs alleged hereinabove, and this suit for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief is his only means to secure adequate and complete redress from Defendants' unlawful and discriminatory practices in connection with its website access and operation.

44. Notice to Defendants is not required because of Defendants' failure to cure the violations.

45. Enforcement of Plaintiff's rights under the ADA and the Rehab Act is right and just pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§2201 and 2202.

46. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned attorneys to represent him in this case and has agreed to pay them a reasonable fee for their services.

COUNT I – VIOLATION OF THE ADA

47. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 46 as if set forth fully herein.

48. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12181(7)(B), Defendant is a public accommodation under the ADA and thus is subject to the ADA.

49. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12181(7)(B), the Website is covered under the ADA because it provides the general public with the ability to locate and learn about Defendants' physical restaurants, purchase food and beverage products that are made in and delivered from, and are also available for purchase in, the physical restaurants, and arrange in-store pickups of food and beverage products purchased online. The Website thus is an extension of, gateway to, and intangible service, privilege, and advantage of Defendants' physical restaurants. Further, the Website also serves to augment Defendants' physical restaurants by providing the public information about the restaurants and by educating the public as to Defendants' available products merchandise sold through the Website and in the physical restaurants.

50. Under Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(1)(A)(II), it is unlawful discrimination to deny individuals with disabilities or a class of individuals with disabilities an opportunity to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodation, which is equal to the opportunities afforded to other individuals.

51. Specifically, under Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(II), unlawful discrimination includes, among other things, “a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations.”

52. In addition, under Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(III), unlawful discrimination includes, among other things, “a failure to take such steps, as may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden.”

53. The Website must comply with the ADA, but it does not as specifically alleged hereinabove and below.

54. Because of the inaccessibility of the Website, individuals with visual disabilities are denied full and equal access to and enjoyment of the goods, information, and services that Defendants have made available to the public on the Website and in their physical restaurants in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12101, *et seq.*, and as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. §12182, *et seq.*

55. The Website was subsequently visited by Plaintiff's expert in September 2022 and the expert determination was that the same access barriers that Plaintiff had initially encountered, as well as numerous additional access barriers, existed. Defendants thus have made insufficient material changes or improvements to the Website to enable its full use and enjoyment by, and accessibility to, blind and visually disabled persons such as Plaintiff. Also, when the Website was visited by the expert, although the Website appeared to have an "accessibility" statement and widget/plugin linked on and displayed from its home page, the "accessibility" statement and widget/plugin, when tested, still could not be effectively used or accessed by, and continued to be a barrier to, blind and visually disabled persons such as Plaintiff. Defendant furthermore has not disclosed to the public any intended audits, changes, or lawsuits to correct the inaccessibility of the Website to visually disabled individuals, nor has it posted on the Website an effective and useful "accessibility" notice, statement, or policy to provide blind and visually disabled person such as Plaintiff with a viable alternative means to access and navigate the Website. Defendant thus has failed to make reasonable modifications in its policies, practices, or procedures when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, in violation of 28 C.F.R. §36.302. The lack of a viable and effective "accessibility" notice, policy, or statement and the numerous access barriers as set forth in the Declaration of Plaintiff's expert, Robert D. Moody, attached hereto as Composite Exhibit "B" and the contents of which are incorporated herein by reference, continue to render the Website not fully accessible to users who are blind and visually disabled, including Plaintiff.

56. More violations may be present on other pages of the Website, which can and will be determined and proven through the discovery process in this case.

57. There are readily available, well-established guidelines on the internet for making Websites accessible to the blind and visually disabled. These guidelines have been followed by other large business entities in making their websites accessible. Examples of such guidelines include, but are not limited to, adding alt-text to graphics and ensuring that all functions can be performed using a keyboard. Incorporating such basic components to make the Website accessible would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendants' business nor would it result in an undue burden to Defendants.

58. Defendants have violated the ADA -- and continue to violate the ADA -- by denying access to the Website by individuals such as Plaintiff with visual disabilities who require the assistance of interface with screen reader software to comprehend and access internet websites. These violations within the Website are ongoing.

59. The ADA requires that public accommodations and places of public accommodation ensure that communication is effective.

60. According to 28 C.F.R. §36.303(b)(1), auxiliary aids and services include "voice, text, and video-based telecommunications products and systems". Indeed, 28 C.F.R. §36.303(b)(2) specifically states that screen reader software is an effective method of making visually delivered material available to individuals who are blind or have low vision.

61. According to 28 C.F.R. §36.303(c), public accommodations must furnish appropriate auxiliary aids and services where necessary to ensure effective communication with individuals with disabilities: "In order to be effective, auxiliary aids and services must be provided in accessible formats, in a timely manner, and in such a way as to protect the privacy and independence of the individual with a disability," 28 C.F.R. §36.303(c)(1)(ii).

62. Part 36 of Title 28 of the C.F.R. was designed and is implemented to effectuate subtitle A of Title III of the ADA, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations, and requires places of public accommodation to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with the accessibility standards established by Part 36.

63. As alleged hereinabove, the Website has not been designed to interface with the widely and readily available technologies that can be used to ensure effective communication, and thus violates the ADA.

64. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' failure to provide an ADA compliant Website, with a nexus to their brick-and-mortar restaurants, Plaintiff has suffered an injury in fact by being denied full access to, enjoyment of, and communication with Defendants' Website and its physical restaurants.

65. Because of the inadequate development and administration of the Website, Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12133 and 28 C.F.R. §36.303, to remedy the ongoing disability discrimination.

66. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12188, this Court is vested with the authority to grant Plaintiff appropriate and necessary injunctive relief, including an order to:

a) Require Defendants to adopt and implement a web accessibility policy to make publicly available and directly link from the homepage of the Website to a functional statement as to the Defendants' policy to ensure persons with disabilities have full and equal access to and enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations through the Website and the physical restaurants.

b) Require Defendants to take the necessary steps to make the Website readily accessible to and usable by blind and visually disabled users, and during that time period prior to the

Website's being made readily accessible, provide an effective alternative method for individuals with visual disabilities to access the information available on the Website until such time that the requisite modifications are made, and

c) Require Defendants to provide the appropriate auxiliary aids such that individuals with visual disabilities will be able to effectively communicate with the Website for purposes of viewing and locating Defendants' physical restaurants and becoming informed of and purchasing Defendants' food and beverage products, and during that time period prior to the Website's being designed to permit individuals with visual disabilities to effectively communicate, to provide an alternative method for individuals with visual disabilities to effectively communicate for such goods and services made available to the general public through the Website and the physical restaurants.

67. Plaintiff is entitled to recover his reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and expenses pursuant to the ADA. To that end, Plaintiff has been obligated to retain the undersigned counsel for the filing and prosecution of this action and has agreed to pay them a reasonable fee for their services.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests entry of judgment in his favor and against Defendant for the following relief:

- A. A declaration that the Website is in violation of the ADA;
- B. An Order requiring Defendants, by a date certain, to update the Website, and continue to monitor and update the Website on an ongoing basis, to remove barriers in order that individuals with visual disabilities can access, and continue to access, the Website and effectively communicate with the Website to the full extent required by Title III of the ADA;

- C. An Order requiring Defendants, by a date certain, to clearly display the universal disabled logo within the Website, wherein the logo¹ would lead to a page which would state Defendant's accessibility information, facts, policies, and accommodations. Such a clear display of the disabled logo is to ensure that individuals who are disabled are aware of the availability of the accessible features of the Website;
- D. An Order requiring Defendants, by a date certain, to provide ongoing support for web accessibility by implementing a website accessibility coordinator, a website application accessibility policy, and providing for website accessibility feedback to ensure compliance thereto;
- E. An Order directing Defendants, by a date certain, to evaluate its policies, practices and procedures toward persons with disabilities, for such reasonable time to allow Defendant to undertake and complete corrective procedures to its Website;
- F. An Order directing Defendants, by a date certain, to establish a policy of web accessibility and accessibility features for the Website to ensure effective communication for individuals who are visually disabled;
- G. An Order requiring, by a date certain, that any third-party vendors who participate on the Website to be fully accessible to the visually disabled;
- H. An Order directing Defendants, by a date certain and at least once yearly thereafter, to provide mandatory web accessibility training to all employees who write or develop programs or code for, or who publish final content to, the Website on how to conform

¹  or similar.

all web content and services with ADA accessibility requirements and applicable accessibility guidelines;

- I. An Order directing Defendants, by a date certain and at least once every three months thereafter, to conduct automated accessibility tests of the Website to identify any instances where the Website is no longer in conformance with the accessibility requirements of the ADA and any applicable accessibility guidelines, and further directing Defendants to send a copy of the twelve (12) quarterly reports to Plaintiff's counsel for review;
- J. An Order directing Defendants, by a date certain, to make publicly available and directly link from the Website homepage, a statement of Defendants' Accessibility Policy to ensure the persons with disabilities have full and equal enjoyment of the Website and shall accompany the public policy statement with an accessible means of submitting accessibility questions and problems;
- K. An award to Plaintiff of her reasonable attorney's fees, costs and expenses; and
- L. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT II – VIOLATION OF THE REHABILITATION ACT (KD TRAN, LLC)

68. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 46 and 55 through 57 as if set forth fully herein.

69. As more specifically set forth above, Defendant KD TRAN has violated the Rehab Act by failing to interface the Website with software utilized by blind and visually disabled individuals. Thus, KD TRAN has violated the following provisions either directly or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements with respect to Plaintiff and other similarly situated individuals solely by reason of their disability:

a) By excluding Plaintiff from participation in and denying him the benefits of or subjecting him to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance as a whole, KD TRAN has violated the Rehab Act;

b) Congress enacted the Rehab Act to enforce the policy of the United States that all programs, projects and activities receiving federal assistance "...be carried out in a manner consistent with the principles of...inclusion, integration and full participation of the individuals [with disabilities]." 29 U.S.C. § 701(c)(3);

c) KD TRAN is the recipient of federal financial assistance to the company as a whole bringing it under the Rehab Act, which prohibits discrimination against qualified or otherwise qualified individuals in all of the recipient's "programs or activities";

d) Section 504 of the Rehab Act prohibits recipients of federal funding as a whole from discriminating against disabled persons and requires that their facilities, programs, and activities be readily accessible to persons with disabilities;

e) The Rehab Act defines "program or activity" as all of the operations of the entire corporation, partnership, or other private organization, or sole proprietorship that receives federal financial assistance as a whole. The Website and its content thus are a "program or activity" within the meaning of the Rehab Act, 29 U.S.C. §794(b)(3)(A);

f) Plaintiff was denied access to the Website solely by reason of his disability. This denial of access to KD TRAN's "program or activity" subjected Plaintiff to discrimination, excluded Plaintiff from participation in the program or activity, and denied Plaintiff the goods, benefits, and services of the Website, a service available to those persons who are not blind or visually disabled. As of this filing, the Website remains inaccessible to qualified or otherwise qualified persons with a visual disability such as Plaintiff;

g) The international website standards organization, WC3, has published widely accepted guidelines (WCAG 2.0 and WCAG 2.1 AA) for making digital content accessible to individuals with disabilities. These guidelines have been endorsed the United States Department of Justice and by Federal courts and the United States Access Board; and

h) KD TRAN has engaged in unlawful practices in violation of the Rehab Act in connection with the operation of the Website. These practices include, but are not limited to, denying Plaintiff, an individual with a disability who, with or without reasonable modifications to the rules, policies, or practices, the removal of communication barriers, or the provision of auxiliary aids and services, meets the essential eligibility requirements for the receipt of services to participate in programs or activities provided by KD TRAN.

70. KD TRAN has acted with deliberate indifference to the applicable provisions of the Rehab Act as to the unlawful practices described herein because KD TRAN is fully aware of the inaccessible features of the Website and has failed to remediate the Website to make it equally accessible to persons with visual disabilities. KD TRAN knew that harm to a federally protected right was substantially likely to occur yet failed to act on that likelihood when they failed to remediate the Website. KD TRAN knew this, and on information and belief, a person with authority with KD TRAN to order the remediation of the Website made a deliberate choice not to remediate, and to continue to offer the inaccessible Website to its customers and potential customers knowing that the Website was, and continues to be, inaccessible to the blind and visually disabled.

71. Plaintiff would like to be a customer at one or more of KD TRAN's brick-and-mortar restaurants but before he goes to any of the restaurants, he would like to determine what good and services are available for his purchasing, what promotions are being offered, and what

new items and services are currently available. In that regard, Plaintiff continues to attempt to utilize the Website and/or plans to continue to attempt to utilize the Website on a regular basis to make selections for purchasing online or in the physical restaurants.

72. Plaintiff is continuously aware of the violations at the Website and is aware that it would be a futile gesture to attempt to utilize the Website as long as those violations exist unless he is willing to suffer additional discrimination.

73. Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, frustration and humiliation as the result of the discriminatory conditions present at the Website. By continuing to operate the Website with discriminatory conditions, KD TRAN contributes to Plaintiff's sense of isolation and segregation and deprives Plaintiff the full and equal access to and enjoyment of the benefits of the programs and activities KD TRAN makes available to the general public. By encountering the discriminatory conditions at the Website and knowing that it would be a futile gesture to attempt to utilize the Website unless he is willing to endure additional discrimination, Plaintiff is deprived of the meaningful choice of freely visiting and utilizing the same stores or the Website that are readily available to the general public, and thus is deterred and discouraged from doing so. By maintaining the Website with access and Rehab Act violations, KD TRAN deprives Plaintiff of equal access to and participation in the benefits of KD TRAN's programs and activities as the non-visually disabled public.

74. Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer direct and indirect injury as a result of KD TRAN's discrimination until KD TRAN is compelled to comply with the requirements of the Rehab Act.

75. Plaintiff has a realistic, credible, existing, and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the Rehab Act with respect to the Website as described

above. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the Rehab Act by KD TRAN. Plaintiff desires to access the Website to avail himself of the benefits therein and/or to assure himself that the Website is in compliance with the Rehab Act so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal access to and enjoyment of the Website without fear of discrimination.

76. Plaintiff and all others similarly situated will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury, and damage without the immediate relief provided by the Rehab Act as requested herein.

77. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm based on the facts alleged hereinabove.

78. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorney's fees, costs, and litigation expenses from KD TRAN pursuant to the Rehab Act, 29 U.S.C. §794a.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests entry of judgment in his favor and against Defendant KD TRAN for the following relief:

- A. A declaration that determines that the Website at the commencement of the subject lawsuit was in violation of the Rehabilitation Act;
- B. A declaration that the Website continues to be in violation of the Rehabilitation Act;
- C. A declaration that Defendant has violated the Rehabilitation Act by failing to monitor and maintain the Website to ensure that it is readily accessible to and usable by persons with visual disabilities;
- D. Issuance of an Order directing Defendant, by a date certain, to alter the Website to make it accessible to, and useable by, individuals with visual disabilities to the full extent required by the Rehabilitation Act;

E. Issuance of an Order directing Defendant to evaluate and neutralize their policies and procedures towards persons with disabilities for such reasonable time so as to allow Defendant to undertake and complete corrective and remedial procedures;

F. Issuance of an Order directing Defendant to continually update and maintain the Website to ensure that it remains fully accessible to and usable by visually disabled individuals;

G. Award Plaintiff his attorney's fees, costs, and litigation expenses pursuant to the Rehabilitation Act; and

H. Award such other relief as the Court deems just and proper and is allowable under the Rehabilitation Act.

DATED: October 12, 2022.

RODERICK V. HANNAH, ESQ., P.A.

Counsel for Plaintiff
4800 N. Hiatus Road
Sunrise, FL 33351
T. 954/362-3800
954/362-3779 (Facsimile)
Email: rhannah@rhannahlaw.com

**LAW OFFICE OF PELAYO
DURAN, P.A.**

Co-Counsel for Plaintiff
4640 N.W. 7th Street
Miami, FL 33126-2309
T. 305/266-9780
305/269-8311 (Facsimile)
Email: duranandassociates@gmail.com

By: s/ Roderick V. Hannah
RODERICK V. HANNAH
Fla. Bar No. 435384

By: s/ Pelayo M. Duran
PELAYO M. DURAN
Fla. Bar No. 0146595